arXiv:1405.2811v1 [astro-ph.SR] 12 May 2014

ISSN 1063-7737, Astronomy Letters, 2014, Vol. 40, No. 6, pp. 352–359. ©Pleiades Publishing, Inc., 2014.
Original Russian Text ©V.V. Bobylev, A.T. Bajkova, 2014, published in Pis'ma v Astronomicheskii Zhurnal, 2014, Vol. 40, No. 6, pp. 396-403.

Search for Kinematic Siblings of the Sun Based on Data from the XHIP Catalog

V. V. Bobylev[1,2] and A. T. Bajkova[1]

[1] *Pulkovo Astronomical Observatory, Russian Academy of Sciences, Pulkovskoe sh. 65, St. Petersburg, 196140 Russia*
[2] *Sobolev Astronomical Institute, St. Petersburg State University, Universitetskii pr. 28, Petrodvorets, 198504 Russia*

Received November 11, 2013

Abstract — From the XHIP catalogue, we have selected 1872 F–G–K stars with relative parallax measurement errors $< 20\%$ and absolute values of their space velocities relative to the Sun < 15 km s^{-1}. For all these stars, we have constructed their Galactic orbits for 4.5 Gyr into the past using an axisymmetric Galactic potential model with allowance made for the perturbations from the spiral density wave. Parameters of the encounter with the solar orbit have been calculated for each orbit. We have detected three new stars whose Galactic orbits were close to the solar one during a long time interval in the past. These stars are HIP 43852, HIP 104047, and HIP 112158. The spectroscopic binary HIP 112158 is poorly suited for the role of a kinematic sibling of the Sun by its age and spectroscopic characteristics. For the single star HIP 43852 and the multiple system HIP 104047, this role is quite possible. We have also confirmed the status of our previously found candidates for close encounters, HIP 47399 and HIP 87382. The star HIP 87382 with a chemical composition very close to the solar one is currently the most likely candidate, because it persistently shows close encounters with the Sun on time scales of more than 3 Gyr when using various Galactic potential models both without and with allowance made for the influence of the spiral density wave.

DOI: 10.1134/S1063773714060012

Keywords:*kinematics, solar counterparts, solar neighborhood, HIP 43852, HIP 104047, HIP 112158, HIP 47399, HIP 87382.*

INTRODUCTION

Searching for stars that could be formed with the Sun in a common cluster is of great interest for studying the long-term evolution of the Solar system in the Galaxy. This problem has been solved in recent years based on stellar proper motions (Brown et al. 2010) and total stellar space velocities (Bobylev et al. 2011).

The stars born together are expected to retain a similar chemical composition for a long time (Bland- Hawthorn and Freeman 2004; Bland-Hawthorn et al. 2010). This provides a basis for the method of searching for chemical counterparts by analyzing spectroscopic data to determine the abundances of various chemical elements. Thus, when searching for kinematic siblings of the Sun, we proceed from the fact that their chemical composition should be maximally close to the solar one.

Not much is known about such specific characteristics of the protosolar cluster as its mass, density, initial size, and the number of members. Therefore, the paper by Pfalzner (2013), where the possible developmental paths of such a cluster are discussed and extensive literature on this question is given, is of great interest. The author argues that the Sun most likely formed in a cluster like an OB association with an initial number of members of at least 1000. Such clusters are known to remain gravitationally bound structures for a very short time (several Myr) and to dissipate rather quickly under the influence of the Galactic gravitational field. However, the density of such structures is not high enough for the protoplanetary disks to be disrupted through mutual encounters of stars.

According to the estimates by Portegies Zwart (2009), 10-60 stars from the protosolar star cluster that initially contained $\sim 10^3$ members can be currently contained in the solar neighborhood with a radius of 100 pc. Mishurov and Acharova (2011) showed that the influence of the spiral density wave could lead to a significant scattering of members of an initially compact cluster. According to their estimate, for about a hundred stars to be observable in the solar neighborhood with a radius of 100 pc, the protosolar cluster must contain at least 104 members. Thus, it is very important to take into account the influence of the spiral density wave in our problem.

This study is aimed at searching for potential candidates that could be formed with the Sun in a common cluster by analyzing their 3D kinematics. For this purpose, we search for stars whose Galactic orbits remained close to the solar one during a long time interval in the past. Possibilities for a new search arise from the appearance of the XHIP compilation (Anderson and Francis 2012), which allows the space velocities of ~ 46000 Hipparcos stars to be analyzed.

DATA

In the XHIP catalogue, the parallaxes were taken from the revised version of the Hipparcos catalogue (van Leeuwen 2007) and the stellar proper motions were taken from the Hipparcos and Tycho-2 (Hog et al. 2000) catalogues or their combination. The radial velocity measurements are available for 46 392 stars. Previously (Bobylev et al. 2011), we worked with the catalogue by Gontcharov (2006) catalogue, which contains the radial velocities for 35 493 Hipparcos stars. There are more stars with measured radial velocities in the XHIP catalogue; new measurements were included for a number of single stars and, what is very important, the data for spectroscopic binaries were checked against the updatable SB9

bibliographic database (Pourbaix et al. 2004).

We selected 1872 F, G, and K stars with relative parallax measurement errors $\sigma_\pi/\pi < 20\%$ and absolute values of their total space velocities relative to the Sun $\sqrt{U^2+V^2+W^2} < 15$ km s^{-1}. Compared to our previous paper (Bobylev et al. 2011), we relaxed significantly the selection criteria and, therefore, the number of stars for our analysis increased by an order of magnitude.

For all these stars, we constructed their Galactic orbits for 4.5 Gyr into the past using the three component axisymmetric Galactic potential model from Fellhauer et al. (2006) by taking into account the perturbations from the spiral density wave (Fernandez et al. 2008). For each stellar orbit, we calculated such parameters of its encounter with the solar orbit as the relative distance d and the relative velocity dV.

It can be assumed that the initial size of the protosolar cluster could be about 10–20 pc. Given that there are errors in the original observational data, we consider the falling of a star into the zone $d < 50$ pc in the time interval $t < -3$ Gyr at a relative velocity dV of several km s^{-1} an encounter.

ORBIT CONSTRUCTION

Potential Model

We calculated the Galactic orbits of the Sun and stars by solving the following system of equations of motion based on a realistic Galactic gravitational potential model:

$$\ddot{\xi} = -\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \xi} - \Omega_0^2(R_0 - \xi) - 2\Omega_0\dot{\eta}, \qquad (1)$$

$$\ddot{\eta} = -\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \eta} + \Omega_0^2\eta + 2\Omega_0\dot{\xi},$$

$$\ddot{\zeta} = -\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \zeta},$$

where Φ is the Galactic gravitational potential; the (ξ, η, ζ) coordinate system centered on the Sun rotates around the Galactic center with a constant angular velocity Ω_0, with the ξ axis being directed toward the Galactic center, the η axis being in the direction of Galactic rotation, and the ζ axis being directed toward the North Galactic Pole; R_0 is the Galactocentric distance of the Sun.

Bobylev et al. (2011) searched for candidates using the Galactic potential model by Allen and Santillan (1991) rigidly tied to $R_0 = 8.5$ kpc. According to the review, for example, by Foster and Cooper (2010), the present-day value of this distance is $R_0 = 8.0 \pm 0.4$ kpc. Therefore, in this paper, we used a potential model that approximated more closely the currently available data. This is the model by Fellhauer et al. (2006):

$$\Phi = \Phi_{halo} + \Phi_{disk} + \Phi_{bulge}, \qquad (2)$$

where

- the halo is represented by a potential dependent on the cylindrical Galactic coordinates R and Z as $\Phi_{halo}(R, Z) = \nu_0^2 \ln(R^2 + d^2)$, where $\nu_0 = 134$ km s^{-1} and $d = 12$ kpc;

- the disk is represented by the Miyamoto– Nagai (1975) potential dependent on the same coordinates: $\Phi_{disk}(R,Z) = -GM_d(R^2 + (b + (Z^2 + c^2)^{1/2})^2)^{-1/2}$, where the disk mass $M_d = 9.3 \times 10^{10}\ M_\odot$, $b = 6.5$ kpc, and $c = 0.26$ kpc;

- the bulge is represented by the Hernquist (1990) potential, $\Phi_{bulge}(R) = -GM_b/(R+a)$, where the bulge mass $M_b = 3.4 \times 10^{10}\ M_\odot$ and $a = 0.7$ kpc.

The Galaxy's circular rotation velocity at the distance $R_0 = 8$ kpc is 220 km s^{-1}. The components of the Sun's peculiar velocity relative to the local standard of rest were taken to be $(U_\odot, V_\odot, W_\odot)_{LSR} = (10, 11, 7)$ km s^{-1} according to the results by Bobylev and Bajkova (2010), in agreement with the results by Schönrich et al. (2010). We take into account the Sun's displacement from the Galactic plane $Z_\odot = 17$ pc (Joshi 2007).

In the case where the spiral density wave is taken into account (Lin and Shu 1964; Lin et al. 1969), the following term (Fernandez et al. 2008) is added to the right-hand side of Eq. (2):

$$\Phi_{sp}(R,\theta,t) = A\cos[m(\Omega_p t - \theta) + \chi(R)], \tag{3}$$

where

$$A = \frac{(R_0\Omega_0)^2 f_{r0}\tan i}{m},$$

$$\chi(R) = -\frac{m}{\tan i}\ln\left(\frac{R}{R_0}\right) + \chi_\odot.$$

Here, A is the amplitude of the spiral density wave potential; f_{r0} is the ratio of the radial perturbation component from the spiral arms to the Galaxy's total attraction; Ω_p is the wave pattern speed; m is the number of spiral arms; i is the pitch angle of the arms, $i < 0$ for a winding pattern; χ is the phase of the radial wave, the arm center then corresponds to the phase $\chi = 0°$; and $\chi_\odot$ is the Sun's radial phase in the spiral density wave.

Parameters of the Spiral Density Wave

The known parameters of the spiral density wave are very unreliable. As analysis of the spatial distribution of young Galactic objects (OB stars, star-forming regions, young open clusters, or HI clouds) shows, a two-armed, three-armed, and four-armed pattern is possible. More complex models are also known (Vallée 2008). This ambiguity is related to large errors in the distances (photometric and kinematic) to distant tracers of the spiral pattern.

Bobylev and Bajkova (2014, 2013b) used data on 80 Galactic masers with known trigonometric parallaxes measured by VLBI with an error, on average, of less than 10% to estimate the pitch angle of the Galactic spiral arms. These masers are associated with very young objects located in regions of active star formation. They are distributed in a wide range of distances, up to $R = 20$ kpc. In the outer arm, we invoked data on 12 very young star clusters with their distances estimated from infrared photometry. Based on a direct estimation method, we showed that the model of a four-armed spiral pattern ($m = 4$) with the pitch angle $i = -13° \pm 1°$ is most likely realized in the Galaxy.

The Sun's radial phase in the spiral density wave depends on the age of sample stars. For example, based on a sample of distant massive OB stars, we found $\chi_\odot = -90°$ (Bobylev and Bajkova 2013c); from masers, we obtained the phase from $\chi_\odot = -140°$ (Bobylev and Bajkova 2014) to $\chi_\odot = -160°$ (Bobylev and Bajkova 2013a); for Cepheids, this parameter

exhibits a noticeable age trend, from $\chi_\odot \approx -150^\circ$ for the youngest ones to $\chi_\odot \approx -240^\circ$ for the oldest ones (Bobylev and Bajkova 2012).

The estimates of the spiral pattern speed Ω_p lie within the range 15–30 km s^{-1} kpc^{-1} (Popova and Loktin 2005; Gerhard 2011; Bobylev and Bajkova 2012). We chose a moderate value, $\Omega_p = 20$ km s^{-1} kpc^{-1}, for our model problem. Since the angular velocity of Galactic rotation in our potential (2) is $\Omega_0 = V_0/R_0 = 27.5$ km s^{-1} kpc^{-1}, the Sun lies within the corotation radius, where the influence of the spiral density wave is strongest (Mishurov and Acharova 2011).

According to the classical approach in the linear theory of density waves (Yuan 1969), the ratio f_{r0} lies within the range 0.04–0.07 and its most probable value is $f_{r0} = 0.05$ (Fernandez et al. 2008). The upper limit $f_{r0} = 0.07$ is determined by the dispersion of young objects observed in the Galaxy (the dispersion at $f_{r0} = 0.07$ should reach 25 km s^{-1}, which exceeds a typical observed value of 10–15 km s^{-1}). Note that Mishurov and Acharova (2011) took a fairly large value, $f_{r0} = 0.1$, to demonstrate the influence of the spiral density wave on the motion of protosolar cluster members; the Sun was located on the corotation circle and, as a result, they estimated the maximum effect.

All of the aforesaid gives us reason to adopt the following parameters of the spiral density wave:

$$\begin{aligned} &m = 4, \\ &i = -13^\circ, \\ &f_{r0} = 0.05, \\ &\chi_\odot = -140^\circ, \\ &\Omega_p = 20 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ kpc}^{-1} \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

as the initial approximation. Some of them, in particular, $\chi_\odot$ and Ω_p, can be varied if necessary.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Model of a Four-Armed Spiral Pattern

Among the selected 1872 F, G, and K stars, only five stars are of interest: HIP 43852, HIP 104047, HIP 112158, HIP 47399, and HIP 87382. We failed to find close encounters with the solar orbit for all the remaining stars.

The first three stars are completely new candidates for the Sun's kinematic siblings. The parameters of their encounter with the solar orbit obtained by taking into account the influence of the four-armed spiral pattern are given in Fig. 1. The physical characteristics of these stars are presented in the table 1. Their analysis leads us to conclude that HIP 112158 is poorly suited for the role of the Sun's kinematic sibling by its age, while this role is quite possible for HIP 43852 and HIP 104047.

It is interesting to check the status of our previously detected candidates for close encounters, HIP 47399 and HIP 87382, with partially new initial data in a new potential with parameters (4). For these stars, there are the corresponding plots of the encounter parameters constructed for a four-armed pattern with $i = -10^\circ$, $f_{r0} = 0.05$, and $\chi_\odot = -117^\circ$ in Bobylev et al. (2011).

Note that the proper motions and radial velocities of these stars in the XHIP catalogue (Anderson and Francis 2012) differ from those that we used previously. The difference for



Figure 1: Parameters of the encounter d and dV of the three stars found with the solar orbit obtained by taking into account the influence of the spiral pattern with parameters (4) versus time.

HIP 87382 is not large; its encounter parameters d and dV shown in Fig. 2, differ only slightly from those derived previously (Fig. 7 in Bobylev et al. 2011).

The difference in initial proper motions (in fact, between the Hipparcos and Tycho-2 data) for HIP 47399 is significant, $\Delta\mu_\alpha \cos\delta \approx 3$ mas yr^{-1} and $\Delta\mu_\delta \approx 0.5$ mas yr^{-1}. At the distance to the star $r = 72$ pc, this difference gives a change in the linear velocity by $\Delta V = 4.74 r \Delta\mu \approx 1$ km s^{-1}, which affects noticeably its orbital parameters; the statistics of encounters with the Sun becomes poorer — there are only rare falls into the neighborhood $d < 150$ pc. Note that using the proper motions from the Tycho-2 catalogue (less accurate than those in the Hipparcos catalogue in terms of random errors) is justified when analyzing the kinematics of double and multiple systems. Below, we provide some of the physical characteristics for the candidates found.

HIP 43852. This is a fairly close single star with unusual properties. For example, based on its kinematic properties, Montes et al. (2001) attributed it to the fairly young (300 Myr) Ursa Major moving group. However, despite its kinematic proximity to the group, Nakajima and Morino (2012) attributed it to field stars due to the absence of brightness

Table 1: Physical characteristics of the stars

HIP	Distance, pc	n	Spectral type	Age, Gyr	[Fe/H]	Mass,$M/M_{\odot}$	Reference
43852	26	1	G5V	6.6	−0.05	0.83	(1,2)
104047	82	3	G0V	4.6	+0.08	1.1+0.74+0.71	(2,6)
112158	66	2	G2II–III, SB		−0.13		(3)
			G7II+A2(–)	0.2		3.6+2.0	(4,5)

n is the number of components in the system. (1) Valenti and Fischer (2005); (2) Casagrande et al. (2011); (3) XHIP (Anderson and Francis 2012); (4) Parsons (2004); (5) Massarotti et al. (2008); (6) Tokovinin (2008).

variability as well as the ultraviolet and X-ray radiation typical of young stars.

The age estimates for this star obtained by Casagrande et al. (2011) by fitting to various (Padova and BASTI) isochrones turned out to be contradictory, from ~ 1 to 13 Gyr.

The age estimate in the table was obtained by Valenti and Fischer (2005) using the set of Yonsei-Yale isochrones (Demarque et al. 2004). The lower and upper age limits were 1.4 and 11.7 Gyr, respectively, with the mean value being 6.6 Gyr. These authors analyzed high-resolution ($R \approx 70000$) spectra taken with the 10-m Keck telescope, the 4-m Anglo-Australian telescope of the Siding Spring Observatory, and the 4-m telescope of the Lick Observatory. Several fundamental parameters determined by these authors include the effective temperature $T_{eff} = 5465$ K; the surface gravity $\log(g) = 4.72$ (where g is in cm s^{-2}); the rotational velocity $v\sin i = 3.7$ km s^{-1}; the relative abundances of the following chemical elements: [M/H] = 0.02, [Na/H] = 0.11, [Si/H] = 0.01, [Ti/H] = 0.09, [Fe/H] = 0.07, and [Ni/H] = 0.04; the mean error in these indices is about 0.03. As we see, the chemical composition of this star is fairly close to the solar one.

HIP 47399. This is a single star. When using the Hipparcos proper motions, its encounters with the Sun are very close (Fig. 6 in Bobylev et al. 2011). Batista and Fernandes (2012) confirmed its solar counterpart status from the viewpoint of chemical composition. For this purpose, they analyzed all of the available published data. All of this leads to the conclusion that the status of this star as a candidate for the Sun's kinematic siblings is retained.

HIP 87382. Valenti and Fischer (2005) determined a number of fundamental parameters for this star: $T_{eff} = 6162$ K, $\log(g) = 4.29$, $v\sin i = 3.6$ km s^{-1}, [M/H] = 0.02, [Na/H] = 0.02, [Si/H] =0.03, [Ti/H] = 0.06, [Fe/H] = 0.03, and [Ni/H] = 0.00. This shows that the chemical composition of HIP 87382 differs only slightly from the solar one, making this star the most likely candidate for the Sun's siblings. Therefore, we carried out a detailed study of its encounters with the Sun using various Galactic potential models (Fellhauer et al. 2006; Allen and Santillan 1991; Bobylev and Bajkova 2014) both without and with allowance made for the influence of the spiral density wave. The parameters of the spiral density wave i and $\chi_{\odot}$ varied within their error limits. We found fairly stable encounters on time scales of more than 3 Gyr into the past.

HIP 104047. This is the multiple (A + BC) system WDS 21047+0332 (Mason et al. 2001). The apparent separation between components A and BC is $a = 3.''18$ (≈260 AU). The lower age limit for the primary component and the metallicity have been determined by various authors quite reliably (Nordström et al. 2004; Casagrande et al. 2011). Thus, this system may be considered a suitable candidate for the Sun's siblings by its kinematics and



Figure 2: Parameters of the encounter d and dV of HIP 87382 with the solar orbit obtained by taking into account the influence of the four-armed spiral pattern with parameters (4) versus time.

chemical composition.

HIP 112158. The star is a well-known (η Peg, Matar) spectroscopic binary (SB1) with a period of 817.5 days (Massarotti et al. 2008). The apparent separation between the components is $a = 0.''045$ ($\approx$3 AU); the hot component may be a binary (Parsons 2004). The dynamical mass estimate for the system, $5.17 \pm 0.72\ M_\odot$ (Malkov et al. 2012), agrees satisfactorily with the estimates obtained by Parsons (2004) by fitting to theoretical evolutionary tracks (see the table). For this system, we used a very reliable value of the systemic radial velocity, $V_\gamma = 4.17 \pm 0.35$ km s^{-1} (Massarotti et al. 2008).

Based on its kinematics and spectroscopic data, this system can be attributed to the Sun's chance traveling companions, a traveling companion for a short time interval, no more than 500 Myr in the past.

The Composite 2 + 4 Spiral Pattern Model

The results of applying a more complex model of the spiral pattern are of great interest. One of them is the composite (2 + 4) model proposed by Lépine et al. (2001). In this model, the spiral density wave potential (3) contains two terms with amplitudes A2 (two-armed component) and A4 (four-armed component). Here, the Sun is on the corotation circle ($\Omega_0 = \Omega_p$) and, as was shown by Mishurov and Acharova (2010), the influence of the spiral pattern is so strong that the test model particles of the cluster are scattered over a significant spatial volume.

The following parameters of the spiral density wave were adopted for the two-armed spiral pattern:

$$\begin{aligned} &m = 2, \\ &i = -7^\circ, \\ &f_{r0} = 0.05, \\ &\chi_\odot = 300^\circ, \\ &\Omega_p = 27.5 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ kpc}^{-1} \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$



Figure 3: Parameters of the encounter d and dV of the three stars found with the solar orbit obtained by taking into account the influence of the (2 + 4) spiral pattern with the parameters (5) and (6) versus time.

and

$$\begin{aligned} &m = 4, \\ &i = -14^\circ, \\ &f_{r0} = 0.035, \\ &\chi_\odot = 140^\circ, \\ &\Omega_p = 27.5 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ kpc}^{-1} \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

for the four-armed spiral pattern. The results are presented in Fig. 3. We can see that there are encounters of interest to us for all three stars. However, these encounters are less close than those obtained in the model of a four-armed spiral pattern with parameters (4), whose results are presented in Fig. 2.

CONCLUSIONS

From the XHIP catalogue (Anderson and Francis 2012), we selected 1872 F–G–K stars with relative parallax measurement errors $\sigma_\pi/\pi < 20\%$ and absolute values of their space velocities relative to the Sun <15 km s^{-1}. We constructed the Galactic orbits for all these

stars for 4.5 Gyr into the past using an axisymmetric Galactic potential model with allowance made for the perturbations from the spiral density wave. The parameters of the encounter with the solar orbit were calculated for each orbit. For this purpose, we used the Galactic potential model proposed by Fellhauer et al. (2006) for $R_0 = 8$ kpc and the model of a four-armed spiral pattern.

We detected three new stars with Galactic orbits close to the solar one in a long time interval into the past. These stars are HIP 43852, HIP 104047, and HIP 112158. The high-mass spectroscopic binary HIP 112158 is poorly suited for the role of the Sun's kinematic sibling by its age. This role is quite possible for the single star HIP 43852 and the multiple system HIP 104047. We confirm the status of our previously found candidates for close encounters, HIP 47399 and HIP 87382.

For the three candidates revealed for the first time, HIP 43852, HIP 104047, and HIP 112158, we modelled their encounters with the Sun for the composite (2+4)model of the spiral pattern (Lépine et al. 2001). This modeling showed the presence of encounters approaches of interest to us, although they turned out to be less close than those obtained in the model of a simple four-armed spiral pattern with parameters (4).

In our opinion, the star HIP 87382 with a nearly solar chemical composition is currently the most likely candidate, because it persistently shows close encounters with the Sun on time scales of more than 3 Gyr when using various axisymmetric Galactic potential models both without and with allowance made for the influence of the spiral density wave with parameters varying within their measurement errors.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to the referees for their useful remarks that contributed to an improvement of the paper. This work was supported by the "Origin and Evolution of Stars and Galaxies" Program P-21 of the Presidium of the Russian Academy of Sciences and the Program of State Support for Leading Scientific Schools of the Russian Federation (project NSh-16245.2012.2, "Multiwavelength Astrophysical Studies"). The work was performed using the SIMBAD search database.

REFERENCES

1. C. Allen and A. Santillan, Rev. Mex. Astron. Astrofis. 22, 255 (1991).
2. E. Anderson and Ch. Francis, Astron. Lett. 38, 331 (2012).
3. S. F. A. Batista and J. Fernandes, New Astron. 17, 514 (2012).
4. J. Bland-Hawthorn and K. Freeman, Publ. Astron. Soc. Austral. 21, 110 (2004).
5. J. Bland-Hawthorn, M. R. Krumholz, and K. Freeman, Astrophys. J. 713, 166 (2010).
6. V. Bobylev and A. Bajkova, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 408, 1788 (2010).
7. V. V. Bobylev, A. T. Bajkova, A. Mylläri, and M. Valtonen, Astron. Lett. 37, 550 (2011).
8. V. V. Bobylev and A. T. Bajkova, Astron. Lett. 38, 638 (2012).
9. V. V. Bobylev and A. T. Bajkova, Astron. Lett. 39, 809 (2013a).
10. V. V. Bobylev and A. T. Bajkova, Astron. Lett. 39, 759 (2013b).
11. V. V. Bobylev and A. T. Bajkova, Astron. Lett. 39, 532 (2013c).
12. V. Bobylev and A. Bajkova, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 437, 1549 (2014).
13. A. G. A. Brown, S. F. Portegies Zwart, and J. Bean, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 407, 458 (2010).

14. L. Casagrande, R. Schönrich, M. Asplund, S. Cassisi, I. Ramirez, J. Melendez, T. Bensby, and S. Feltzing, Astron. Astrophys. 530, 138 (2011).

15. P. Demarque, J.-H. Woo, Y.-C. Kim, and K. Sukyoung, Astrophys. J. Suppl. Ser. 155, 667 (2004).

16. M. Fellhauer, V. Belokurov, N. W. Evans, M. I. Wilkinson, D. B. Zucker, G. Gilmore, M. J. Irwin, D. M. Bramich, et al., Astrophys. J. 651, 167 (2006).

17. D. Fernandez, F. Figueras, and J. Torra, Astron. Astrophys. 480, 735 (2008).

18. T. Foster and B. Cooper, ASP Conf. Ser. 438, 16 (2010).

19. O. Gerhard, Mem. Soc. Astron. Ital. Suppl. 18, 185 (2011).

20. G. A. Gontcharov, Astron. Lett. 32, 759 (2006).

21. L. Hernquist, Astrophys. J. 356, 359 (1990).

22. E. Høg, C. Fabricius, V. V. Makarov, S. Urban, T. Corbin, G. Wycoff, U. Bastian, P. Schwekendiek, and A.Wicenec, Astron. Astrophys. 355, L27 (2000).

23. Y. C. Joshi, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 378, 768 (2007).

24. F. van Leeuwen, Astron. Astrophys. 474, 653 (2007).

25. J. R. D. Lépine, Yu. N. Mishurov, and S. Yu. Dedikov, Astrophys. J. 546, 234 (2001).

26. C. C. Lin and F. H. Shu, Astrophys. J. 140, 646 (1964).

27. C. C. Lin, C. Yuan, and F. H. Shu, Astrophys. J. 155, 721 (1969).

28. O. Yu. Malkov, V. S. Tamazian, J. A. Docobo, and D. A. Chulkov, Astron. Astrophys. 546, 69 (2012).

29. B. D. Mason, G. L. Wycoff, W. I. Hartkopf, G. G. Douglass, and C. E. Worley, Astron. J. 122, 3466 (2001).

30. A. Massarotti, D. W. Latham, R. P. Stefanik, P. Robert, and J. Fogel, Astron. J. 135, 209 (2008).

31. Yu. N. Mishurov and I. A. Acharova, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 412, 1771 (2011).

32. M. Miyamoto and R. Nagai, Publ. Astron. Soc. Jpn. 27, 533 (1975).

33. D. Montes, J. López-Santiago, M. C. Gálvez, M. J. Fernandez-Figueroa, E. De Castro, and M. Cornide, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 328, 45 (2001).

34. T. Nakajima and J.-I. Morino, Astron. J. 143, 2 (2012).

35. B. Nordström, M. Mayor, J. Andersen, J. Holmberg, F. Pont, B. R. Jorgensen, E. H. Olsen, S. Udry, and N. Mowlavi, Astron. Astrophys. 419, 989 (2004).

36. S. B. Parsons, Astron. J. 127, 2915 (2004).

37. S. Pfalzner, Astron. Astrophys. 549, 82 (2013).

38. M. E. Popova and A. V. Loktin, Astron. Lett. 31, 171 (2005).

39. S. F. Portegies Zwart, Astrophys. J. 696, L13 (2009).

40. D. Pourbaix, A. A. Tokovinin, A. H. Batten, F. C. Fekel, W. I. Hartkopf, H. Levato, N. I. Morrell, G. Torres, and S. Udry, Astron. Astrophys. 424, 727 (2004).

41. R. Schönrich, J. Binney, and W. Dehnen, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 403, 1829 (2010).

42. A. Tokovinin, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 389, 925 (2008).

43. J. A. Valenti and D. A. Fischer, Astrophys. J. Suppl. Ser. 159, 141 (2005).

44. J. P. Vallée, Astron. J. 135, 1301 (2008).

45. C. Yuan, Astrophys. J. 158, 889 (1969).